in dens, and caves, and forests; and thence they have issuec to plunder all that is good, to waste all that is lovely, and t< allure the young and adventurous to their haunts. In the hop< held out to them of freedom from all restraint. Strange as i may seem, our modern philosophers have generally left these facts very much out of account in constructing their systems and have jostled them into a kind of separate chapter or ap pendix, in which they treat of objections to a theory already formed.

The sceptic has revelled in this field as the raven revels ii corruption. He finds a kind of fiendish delight in pointing to the apparent oversights and irregularities., blunders and crimes in the Divine government. The Greek sophists toiled in thi work, and rejoiced in the doubt and confusion which they intro duced into human speculation. Gotta, the academic in *Cicero d naturft, dcomm*—representing that large portion of the learne< who wish to inquire into everything., but to believe as little a possible, who ask, What is truth ? while not willing to wait fo the reply—fondly dwells on the misfortunes and sufferings t which those supposed to be good are so often exposed. [a] Wlvj therefore, did the Carthaginians oppress in Spain the two Scipioi among the best and wisest of men ?" &c. Volney, in wandei ing over the ruins of empires, feels a pleasure allied to that < the conquerors who battered down the walls, and set fire to tb houses and temples of depopulated cities; he seems as if ric ding himself of an enemy who stood in his way, and who we thwarting the schemes on which his heart was set.

Our popular writers on natural religion contemplate wit great interest a particular class of phenomena,, and, founding o them, they demonstrate that God is a being of infinite beriev< lence. But the sceptic appears, and points to another order <

facts, scarcely, if at all, less numerous and momentous; an
insists, that if the one class of facts proves that God is good, tl
other, on the very same principle, proves that God is rnalev<
lent, or that he takes no interest in the world. Placing the 01
of these conclusions over against the other, they make them, lil
antagonist forces, destroy each other, and leave nothing but
blank and universal void. But instead of making^ them oppoi
each other, lot us seek to combine them. We ntay agree \vi1
the theologians who regard them as not contradictory, while v